

**PORTLAND HARBOR CAG**  
**AUGUST 14, 2002**  
**800 NE OREGON ST**

**DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Members Present:**

Neighborhood Associations:  
Cathy Crawford-University Park  
Larry Talbert - Hinoon

Business:  
Steve Gunther - Progressive Products and Services

Recreation:

Environment:  
Dorothy Shoemaker - Sierra Club  
Rhett Lawrence - OSPIRG

Public Health:  
Travis Williams - Willamette Riverkeeper  
Joe Keating - Oregon Center for Environmental Health  
Billy Washington - EJAG

At Large:  
Non-Responsive - Citizen  
Non- - Citizen

Visitors:  
M. J. Bey, League of Women Voters  
Non- , Citizen  
Chip Humphrey, EPA Region 10  
Wallace Reid EPA Region 10  
Barbara Smith, Lower Willamette Group  
Judy Smith, EPA  
Janice Paniciello, State of Oregon

**Minutes Approval:**

The minutes were reviewed by several members and then approved.

**Presentation by Regina Skarzinskas:**

The draft version of the Workplan prepared by DEQ for upland and EPA for in-water of the RI/FS for the Portland Harbor Superfund has been printed and digitized on CD by the Lower Willamette Group and made available to the Citizens Advisory Group. To assist the members in

interpreting the Workplan, and create more understanding of the information held within the Workplan, Regina prepared and printed a glossary for the members to use while examining the document. She explained that the document was written in advanced technical language. Regina suggested the comments made regarding the issues discussed in the Workplan need to reflect our community's needs. In general, we should offer comments as a group.

The following is an outline of the documents as Regina offered:

Initially the document covers the history of the area, the river and its uses. The river reflects years of multiple uses and abuses that have accumulated to create its condition at present. Years of human and industrial waste dumped in the river forming the residue that requires the attention and clean up of today's efforts.

The Superfund Project work will be pursued in three major phases.

#### I. Remedial Investigation

The information gathered will include:

- An examination of uses of the river,
- A review of the historical uses and misuses
- A look at potential or future uses: various activities, businesses, recreation
- A study of the chemicals presently existing in the water

It is time to start collecting thorough and complete data in order to have enough information to make an informed decision upon. While several groups such as the Oregonian and the Sierra Club have made a concerted effort to gather and present data of fish tissue sampling, none could bear the burden of labor, time and cost to do a full-scale study needed to properly proceed with the Harbor Clean-up. The data gathered must be complete, valid, and thorough enough to prepare those technicians who are engineering the final remediation.

#### II. Risk Assessment

In order to qualify the risk to humans and animals or habitat, there must be a study of human and ecological receptors to see if the contaminants impact those receptors negatively. It is a snapshot of the effects of the river, not necessarily a hard number but a review of how the contaminants could pose a health problem to the human population and others.

When evaluating the effect of the contaminants, the health risks are divided into two categories: (1) those which cause cancer and (2) those which produce negative health effects that are non-cancerous, such as kidney disease, sniffles, rashes, reproductive cycle problems or others. For instance, studies have shown that humans who have worked around Benzene have a greater risk of acquiring cancer.

In the handout are listed types of impacts including Acute. A study would determine the dosage level of a chemical required to cause an immediate effect. But also a study looking at long range effects would or could be included.

Animals are used in these studies as representative of human samplings, perhaps mice, rats or other test animals but usually a variety of animals are used. EPA examines the studies and determines the

confidence level attached to the conclusions of the study.

Regina's initial reaction after studying the Workplan is that more documentation will be required before the final draft could be presented.

Steve Gunther asked if the cost issues will be included in their Workplan and if the CAG would have access to that information.

Regina stated that the cost information was not part of the Workplan as presented.

### III. Remedial Design

#### Lower Willamette Group- Goals for Sampling

- Determine minimum health risks or standards
- Decide what the detection limits should be
- What would be the levels for various chemicals where there are considered a non-detect.

Non-detect limits should be examined because if the assigned limits of the contaminants were set too high then when using that data certain contaminants would have screened out or would not be included because the data would have been too low to capture. The problem lies where if a combination of these contaminant levels could actually be detrimental in terms of human health risks, they would have been eliminated (each as non-detect) prior to reaching the level of study where they become examined as a health risk.

#### Field Sampling Workplan

Questions to ask when reviewing the Field Sampling Workplan:

- Should we add to the sampling?
- Was it a large enough sampling?
- Should we have an overview of the locales that need further emphasis?

#### Remedial Investigation

- The development of analytical goals
- Field Sampling
- Health and Safety

#### Risk Assessment

- Ecological risk assessment
- Human health risk assessment

#### Feasibility Study

Early Action Study Guidelines - This would be a study to determine if there are contaminants that need special focus because of their health risks; or, if there are hot spots identified on the river that require special focus because of their extremely high levels and perhaps combined with particular risks.

#### The Workplan

As an overview the Workplan gathers information stating the how, when, why, what, and any special needs or samplings that will be used to do the study . . . it is a step-by-step proposal to do the study, a cookbook approach if you will, to examine the river. Included will be a map of sample sites used by the EPA, identifying problem areas and hot spots.

The general time frame for doing sediment sampling will probably begin in October of 2002.

The Workplan itself will not be complete or approved until after October 2002.

Joe Keating asked if the fish sampling had begun.

Regina replied that the initial stages had started.

Joe Keating asked why have we not been privy to this information. He stated that it would be important that there not be a lag between the onset of sampling and the information from the results be forwarded to the CAG.

When reviewing the RI, the CAG may want to focus on the types of fish communities that are being used for the sampling. For instance, she stated that the sturgeon had been omitted and asked, should the sturgeon been left from the study considering its popularity in the Portland area.

Also, Early Action Guidelines should be closely read and commented on. Early Action Guidelines are those areas that are thought contain heavy problem contaminants either by volume or type, therefore requiring special focus when evaluating their circumstance.

Sediment sampling will provide initial information on which to base the focus for those hot spots or special problems.

Presently, the Workplan is not fully documented.

While the DEQ handles the upland portion and EPA focuses on the in-water part of the project, each has their own methods and approaches such as non-detect limits. At some point each group will need to communicate and coordinate with the other in areas where each has its own approach as to what criterion to use when making decisions on final remediation. So far, this coordination is not reflected in the Workplan. Ultimately, sooner rather than later, their communication and sharing of ideas will need to begin so that whatever adjustments are necessary can be made in a timely manner.

The EPA does not follow the DEQ's guidelines.

Examples of their diversion from EPA is in DEQ's Human Health Risk Assessment:

- Is more stringent.
- Is different in how they look at each chemical.
- Is different in how they choose exposure point.

EPA's approach is to use Risk Assessment Guidance for Superfund, (RAGS).

Joe Keating asked if Regina's role was to evaluate the Workplan and decide the best response to EPA as to the acceptability of the procedures. Regina explained that it was Travis Williams' role to deliver the Workplan and then Regina would interpret the technical information to the group, then the group would decide if the procedures outlined in the Workplan were acceptable or would meet the group's criterion for the community as representatives of the community.

Regina said another observation she made from the Workplan was that the EPA was not going to evaluate the surface water:

- o Surface water may be critical because it can contaminate the soil.
- o Surface water could contaminate the water used for plants/crops that would mean the plants could draw the chemicals from the surface water.
- Another species not included in the tissue sampling were Lamprey eel. She stated the lamprey might be important because of the exposure to the Native Americans as part of their diet and culture.
- Or, if surface water is more of a source control problem then it becomes part of DEQ's responsibility.

Regina questioned: How will the Workplan go together without DEQ and EPA "connecting" on the subject of surface water?

Steve Gunther asked if the funds for the Superfund were coming from the tax base. He also wanted to know what the cost of the RI/FS was up to this point. Regina deferred to Barbara Harris of the Lower Willamette Group.

Barbara Harris said she could offer some of the general numbers from the accounting for the LWG. Steve asked if it were possible to know costs in a breakdown from the individual PRP's. She said that he would need to contact the companies individually because some the PRP's were private companies and their expenditures were part of their private business.

Billy Washington asked: What will happen to the sediment once it had been dredged? Where will it be moved or stored? What is its ultimate storage destination?

Regina replied that it may be capped, it may be moved, and that there are a variety of possibilities and until RI/FS is completed, that decision will not be made.

Steve Gunther asked, how will cost determine what choices will be made.

Regina said that the overall product gives you the ultimate result.

Doug asked about the money remaining in the supporting funds for the Superfund and did Travis speak on the radio regarding this issue? Travis replied he was publicizing the need to call Senators and Congressman to request that they vote to continue to allocate funds for the Superfund. There are only 25 million dollars left in the national fund.

Barbara Harris stated that the two groups have paid 2 ½ million dollars so far, and ultimately it will cost 10-20 million over all.

Joe Keating suggested that a subcommittee be formed to outline a process to follow. He said we need someone to collect the comments on the Workplan and then the group would study and discuss.

Regina outlined a format for evaluating the Workplan as follows:

1. The CAG should obtain the available information from the participating groups, i.e. EPA, DEQ, LWG and any other agency or group making a contribution to the clean up.
2. The CAG should provide feedback to the parties regarding the pertinent information.
3. The CAG should provide information to the citizens of Portland, their individual constituencies and the public in general.

The CAG might draw up a Wish List suggesting ideas of procedure for actual clean up. She noted that the Sturgeon was omitted from the study and found it odd considering its popularity for catching and eating. Also, she found it unusual that the Lamprey was not included on the study list, as Native Americans use it for ceremonial purposes as well as part of their diet. Also, the Lamprey young can remain and ingest sediment for one to seven years while they mature prior to migrating to the ocean.

Regina said the CAG could pursue a plan for submitting comments to different agencies by:

1. Looking at the entire Workplan and drafting an Overview after reading it.
2. At that time, the group would create a collection of General comments.
3. Then, divide the Workplan in sections making specific comments while rendering opinions.

Joe Keating declared he would take responsibility for a plan to direct comments.

Travis suggested a Facilitator and was supported by several others. He explained that a Facilitator would help to produce more effective and efficient discourse during the General Meeting. Mark Burton agreed to serve as facilitator for the next meeting.

**NEXT MEETING**

The next General Meeting will be September 17, 2002, Tuesday from 6-8 PM at The Oregon Building, 800 NE Oregon St.

Respectfully submitted, Non- [REDACTED] - Member at Large